



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

resided in the United States and acted as manager of the plaintiff corporation. The four individual stockholders constituted the board of directors. A motion was made to stay the further prosecution of the suit on the ground that the plaintiff was an alien enemy. *Held*, that the suit might be maintained because the corporation should be regarded as an entity separate and apart from its stockholders and because the control of the company was vested in a board of directors, of whom the majority (including the manager) were residents of the United States. *Fritz Schultz, Jr., Co., v. Raimes & Co.* (1917, N. Y. Sup. Ct.), 166 N. Y. Supp. 567. See COMMENTS, p. 108.

BANKRUPTCY—REVIVING BARRED DEBT AS FRAUDULENT "INCUMBRANCE."—The day before a petition in bankruptcy was filed against him, a debtor made a payment upon a statute-barred debt, intending to revive it. The debtor was aware of his insolvent condition, the creditor was not. The creditor, offering to restore the payment, filed his claim on the revived debt. *Held*, that the claim should be disallowed, its revival being an "incumbrance" of the bankrupt's property and void under section 67e of the Bankruptcy Act. *In re Salmon* (1916, S. D. N. Y.) 239 Fed. 413. See COMMENTS, p. 126.

BILLS AND NOTES—HOLDER IN DUE COURSE—CORPORATION'S CHECK USED IN INTEREST OF FISCAL OFFICER.—W. was treasurer of the plaintiff corporation and also of the B. company. The defendant bank held for collection a note of the B. company which W. had indorsed. To pay this note W. wrongfully drew the plaintiff company's check, signed by himself as treasurer, to the order of the defendant. This check, after being certified, was received by the defendant from a representative of the B. company in payment of the note on its date of maturity. *Held*, that there was nothing in the transaction to put the defendant bank on notice that W. was misappropriating the funds of the plaintiff to pay his own debt. *Colonial Fur Ranching Co. v. First Nat. Bank* (1917, Mass.) 116 N. E. 731.

The fact that the corporate obligation is drawn by the official payable to himself and used to pay his own debt is not of itself constructive notice of lack of authority. *Fillebrown v. Hayward* (1906) 190 Mass. 472, 77 N. E. 45; *contra*, *Rochester Turnpike Road Co. v. Paviour* (1900) 164 N. Y. 281, 58 N. E. 114. But even in Massachusetts, where the instrument is made payable to a creditor of the officer, the creditor takes at his peril. *Johnson v. Longley Co.* (1910) 207 Mass. 52, 56, 92 N. E. 1035. The question before the court in the principal case was whether or not it would carry this doctrine farther and apply it where the officer was not absolutely liable to the payee, as a debtor, but only contingently as an indorser. The liability of a bankrupt indorser has been called a provable "debt." *In re Philip Semmer Glass Co.* (1905 C. C. A., 2d) 135 Fed. 77. But the purpose of the Bankruptcy Act was to relieve insolvents from their pecuniary liabilities. *Moch v. Market*